



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

C  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/788,339	02/21/2001	Sadaji Tsuge	TOR.011.0001.NP	1063
58789	7590	06/14/2007	EXAMINER	
NDQ&M WATCHSTONE LLP 1300 EYE STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WEST TOWER WASHINGTON, DC 20005			BARTON, JEFFREY THOMAS	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1753		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/14/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/788,339	TSUGE, SADAJI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jeffrey T. Barton	1753	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 16-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 16-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 24 April 2007 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The language "at least 0.3 µg/g" is open to values above 3 µg/g (e.g. 5, 10, 20 or more µg/g), which find no support in the instant disclosure.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 16-20, 23-24, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 11-307791 (herein referred to as JP '791) in view of Yamagishi et al (U.S. Patent 6,300,556), Brandhorst, Jr (U.S. Patent 4,131,486), Spitzer (U.S. Patent 4,667,060), and the instant disclosure.

Regarding claim 16, JP '791 discloses a solar cell module (Figures 1 and 2) comprising a solar cell element (1); a light incidence side light transmitting member made of glass (3) adhered at a light incidence side of the solar cell element by a resin (EVA 2 lying between the cells 1 and glass 3; Paragraph 0023); a rear surface member comprising a resin film (PET film 4) adhered at a rear surface side of the solar cell

element by a resin (EVA 2 lying between cells 1 and PET film 4; Paragraph 0023); wherein the solar cell element (Figure 2) comprises a semiconductor junction so as to form an electric field (Across pin junction formed by layers 11-13) and is sealed with the EVA resin layer 2 (Paragraphs 0023 and 0024).

Both the front surface side light transmitting member 3 and the rear surface member 4 transmit incident light (see Figures 1, 5, and 6). The sealing resin 2 is interposed between the front surface light transmitting member 3 and the solar cells 1 and is also interposed between the rear surface member 4 and the solar cells 1 (see Figure 1). With respect to the solar cell in JP '791's Figure 2, note in JP '791's paragraph 0024 that it is taught that on one principal plane of the n-type crystalline silicon substrate 11, there is laminated an i-type a-Si layer 12 and p-type a-Si layer 13. It is also taught that on the principal plane on another side of the n-type crystalline silicon substrate 11 there is laminated i-type a-Si layer 16 and n-type a-Si layer 17 (see paragraph 0024). The solar cell 1 has two transparent electrodes 14 and 18 at the top and bottom surfaces (see Figure 2; and paragraph 0024). These electrodes allow light to enter from both the front and rear surfaces of the solar cell module (see Figures 1, 5, and 6). The rear surface member is formed of a transparent resin film (PET) (see Figure 1; and paragraph (0025)).

JP '791 does not explicitly teach that the resin adhering the light incidence side light transmitting member at the light incidence side of the solar cell element contains sodium ion, nor does the reference explicitly disclose that a one conductive type

crystalline semiconductor substrate is disposed between the semiconductor junction and the resin containing the sodium ion.

Yamagishi et al discloses the use of soda lime glass, which contains sodium, as a front surface member (Column 7, line 29). Soda lime glass is a conventional glass used in solar cell modules because it is inexpensive.

The instant disclosure teaches that sodium ions from the front glass in solar modules of this type diffuse from the glass into the resin that adheres the glass to the solar cells. After conventional testing, the amount of sodium disclosed as present in the resin is 0.3 µg/g. (Specification Page 5, line 19 - Page 7, line 2)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the solar cell module of JP '791 to use soda lime glass as the front surface member, as taught by Yamagishi et al, because soda lime glass is very inexpensive and provides excellent weather resistance. The selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a *prima facie* obviousness determination in *Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.*, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945). See MPEP 2144.07.

In such a combination, the presence of sodium ions in the resin lying between the cells and the glass member must be considered inherent, inasmuch as the instant disclosure teaches that sodium ions diffuse from a glass layer into the sealing resin under conventional conditions (Specification Page 5, line 19 - Page 7, line 2) Specific to

claim 17, the specification teaches that this level of sodium ions in the resin results from standard test conditions, which would clearly obviously result in the combination taught above.

Regarding the position of the n-type crystalline substrate 11 with respect to the thin film amorphous layers 12, 13 and the light incidence side light transmitting member, the solar cell module of JP '791 allows light to enter from both sides (Figures 1, 5, and 6), but the front surface side light transmitting member 3 is at the principal light incidence side (see paragraphs 0023 and 0026-0028). Therefore, light coming in from either direction contributes to the generation of electricity. Furthermore, with respect to the solar cell in JP '791's Figure 2, note in JP '791's paragraph 0024 that it is taught that on one principal plane of the crystalline silicon substrate 11, there is laminated an i-type a-Si layer 12 and p-type a-Si layer 13. It is also taught that on the principal plane on another side of the crystalline silicon substrate 11 there is laminated i-type a-Si layer 16 and n-type a-Si layer 17 (see paragraph 0024). JP '791 does not require said one principal plane on which the i-type a-Si layer 12 and p-type a-Si layer 13 to be the front face. JP '791 exemplifies the front face and recites "front face" in parenthesis for layers 12 and 13, and exemplifies the rear face and recites "rear face" in parenthesis for layers 16 and 17 (see paragraph 0024; and Figure 2). However, JP '791 does not require layers 12 and 13 to be at the front surface and layers 16 and 17 to be at the rear face. Thus, a skilled artisan readily recognizes that the solar cell seen in Figure 2 of JP '791 can be placed in JP '791's module in Figure 1 with layers 12 and 13 at the front face (i.e., layers 12 and 13 closer to light transmitting member 3) or at the rear face (i.e.,

layers 12 and 13 closer to rear surface member 4). Such is the case because the solar cell in said Figure 2 can receive light from both sides (see Figure 1; and the first sentence of paragraph 0024). Furthermore, the presence of a photovoltaic junction at the rear face of a solar cell is well known in the art as shown by Brandhorst, Jr (Figures 2 and 4; and col. 1, line 60 through col. 2, line 25) and Spitzer (see Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have prepared JP '701's solar cell module such that the solar cell in JP '791's Figure 2 is present in the module with the p-i-n junction between layers 11, 12 and 13 at the rear face of the solar cell, and thus, the n-type crystalline silicon substrate 11 is between the resin adjacent principal light transmitting member 3 and the junction formed between p-type a-Si layer 13 and n-type substrate 11 because light can enter from both sides of JP '791's solar cell and thus, the p-i-n junction can be closer to either the light transmitting member 3 or the rear surface member 4; JP '791 is not limited to layers 12 and 13 to be at the front surface; and the presence of a photovoltaic junction at the rear face of a solar cell is well known in the art as shown by Brandhorst, Jr and Spitzer. In other words, to take the solar cell in JP '791's Figure 2, flip it over it over, and then insert it into JP '791's Figure 1, would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art because light can enter from both sides of JP '791's solar cell in Figure 2, and thus, the p-i-n junction can be closer to either the light transmitting member 3 or the rear surface member 4; JP '791 is not limited to layers 12 and 13 to be at the front surface; and the presence of a photovoltaic junction at the rear face of a solar cell is well known in the art as shown by Brandhorst, Jr and Spitzer.

Regarding claim 18, JP '791 teaches that n-type substrate 11 consists of single crystalline silicon. (Paragraph 0024) As there is no teaching of a thickness required to shield diffusion of sodium ion in the instant specification, the thickness of this substrate is considered to inherently provide some shielding of the diffusion of sodium ion as claimed.

Regarding claim 19, in the combination described above, n-type a-Si layer 17 will be disposed between the n-type c-Si substrate 11 and the resin containing sodium ion.

Regarding claim 20, in the combination described above, transparent ITO electrode 18 will be disposed between the n-type a-Si layer 17 and the resin containing sodium ion.

Regarding claim 23, in the combination described above, the semiconductor junction is formed between the n-type crystalline substrate 11 and the p-type amorphous layer 13.

Regarding claim 24, in the combination described above, i-type a-Si layer 12 is disposed between p-type a-Si layer 13 and n-type c-Si substrate 11.

Regarding claim 26, in the combination described above, n-type layer 17 is made of amorphous silicon.

Regarding claim 27, in the combination described above, i-type a-Si layer 16 is disposed between n-type c-Si substrate 11 and n-type a-Si layer 17.

In this rejection undue weight cannot be given to the limitation "to shield

7. Claims 16-20, 22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandhorst, Jr. in view of Mimura et al and the instant disclosure.

Regarding claim 16, Brandhorst, Jr. discloses a solar cell element comprising a semiconductor junction so as to form an electric field (i.e. junction 11 between p-type substrate 10 and n+ type layer 12; Figure 1) The cell is designed such that incident light is to impinge upon the cell on the side of substrate 10 opposite junction 11.

Regarding claim 18, Brandhorst, Jr. discloses that p-type substrate 10 comprises single crystal silicon. (Column 2, lines 7-9)

Regarding claim 19, Brandhorst, Jr. teaches a p+ layer 16 disposed on the light-incident side substrate 10.

Regarding claim 20, electrode layer 18 of Brandhorst, Jr. allows light to pass into the cell (Column 3, lines 8-14), and therefore reads on a "transparent electrode".

Regarding claim 22, Brandhorst, Jr. discloses that n+ layer 12 is formed by diffusion of n-type dopants into crystalline substrate 10. (Column 2, lines 60-66) The layer is therefore crystalline as claimed.

Regarding claim 25, Brandhorst, Jr. discloses that p+ layer 16 is formed by diffusion of p-type dopants into crystalline substrate 10. (Column 3, lines 3-8) The layer is therefore crystalline as claimed.

Brandhorst, Jr. does not explicitly disclose the instant light incidence side light transmitting member, rear surface member, resin, or sodium ion present in the resin. Brandhorst, Jr. is silent concerning encapsulation of the cell.

Mimura et al teach an encapsulation system for solar cells (Figure 1), comprising a soda-lime glass light incident side light transmitting member (105; Column 7, lines 25-67) that is adhered to a light incidence side of the solar cell by a resin (Filler 103 disposed between the cells and glass; Figure 1; Column 6, lines 52-67); a rear surface member comprising a resin film (e.g. TEDLAR Backside covering member 102; Column 6, lines 29-51) that is adhered to the rear surface of the solar cell by a resin (Filler 103 disposed between the cells and member 102; Figure 1; Column 6, lines 52-67) The cells are sealed in filler 103 between plate 105 and member 102. (Figure 1)

The instant disclosure teaches that sodium ions from the front glass in solar modules of this type diffuse from the glass into the resin that adheres the glass to the solar cells. After conventional testing, the amount of sodium disclosed as present in the resin is 0.3 µg/g. (Specification Page 5, line 19 - Page 7, line 2)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Brandhorst, Jr. by specifically encapsulating the cells in the encapsulation system of Mimura et al, because Mimura suggests that any conventional cell is suitable for encapsulation in their system (Column 7, lines 1-6), and it is well recognized in the art that the useful lifetime of silicon solar cells is greatly lengthened by encapsulating them to protect them from corrosion caused by atmospheric oxygen and water vapor. In such a combination, obviously the light incident side of Brandhorst, Jr. (Top side in Figure 1) would be placed closest to the

glass layer 105 of Mimura et al, since layer 105 faces incoming radiation. (Mimura et al Figure 1; Column 7, lines 25-32) Such positioning meets the limitations of claims 16, 18-20, 22, and 25.

In such a combination, the presence of sodium ions in the resin filler lying between the cells and the glass member must be considered inherent, inasmuch as the instant disclosure teaches that sodium ions diffuse from a glass layer into the sealing resin under conventional conditions (Specification Page 5, line 19 - Page 7, line 2). Specific to claim 17, the specification teaches that this level of sodium ions in the resin results from standard test conditions, which would clearly obviously result in the combination taught above.

Regarding claim 18, since there is no teaching of a thickness required to shield diffusion of sodium ion in the instant specification, the thickness of substrate 10 of Brandhorst, Jr. is considered to inherently provide some shielding of the diffusion of sodium ion as claimed.

8. Claims 16-20, 22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mimura et al in view of Brandhorst, Jr. et al and the instant disclosure.

Regarding claim 16, Mimura et al teach an encapsulation system for solar cells (Figure 1), comprising a soda-lime glass light incident side light transmitting member (105; Column 7, lines 25-67) that is adhered to a light incidence side of the solar cell by a resin (Filler 103 disposed between the cells and glass; Figure 1; Column 6, lines 52-

67); a rear surface member comprising a resin film (e.g. TEDLAR Backside covering member 102; Column 6, lines 29-51) that is adhered to the rear surface of the solar cell by a resin (Filler 103 disposed between the cells and member 102; Figure 1; Column 6, lines 52-67) The cells are sealed in filler 103 between plate 105 and member 102. (Figure 1)

Mimura et al do not specifically teach a solar cell element comprising a one conductive type crystalline semiconductor substrate between the semiconductor junction and resin containing sodium ion.

Regarding claim 16, Brandhorst, Jr. discloses a solar cell element comprising a semiconductor junction so as to form an electric field (i.e. junction 11 between p-type substrate 10 and n+ type layer 12; Figure 1) The cell is designed such that incident light is to impinge upon the cell on the side of substrate 10 opposite junction 11.

Regarding claim 18, Brandhorst, Jr. discloses that p-type substrate 10 comprises single crystal silicon. (Column 2, lines 7-9)

Regarding claim 19, Brandhorst, Jr. teaches a p+ layer 16 disposed on the light-incident side substrate 10.

Regarding claim 20, electrode layer 18 of Brandhorst, Jr. allows light to pass into the cell (Column 3, lines 8-14), and therefore reads on a "transparent electrode".

Regarding claim 22, Brandhorst, Jr. discloses that n+ layer 12 is formed by diffusion of n-type dopants into crystalline substrate 10. (Column 2, lines 60-66) The layer is therefore crystalline as claimed.

Regarding claim 25, Brandhorst, Jr. discloses that p+ layer 16 is formed by diffusion of p-type dopants into crystalline substrate 10. (Column 3, lines 3-8) The layer is therefore crystalline as claimed.

The instant disclosure teaches that sodium ions from the front glass in solar modules of this type diffuse from the glass into the resin that adheres the glass to the solar cells. After conventional testing, the amount of sodium disclosed as present in the resin is 0.3 µg/g. (Specification Page 5, line 19 - Page 7, line 2)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Mimura et al by specifically installing the solar cells of Brandhorst, Jr., because Mimura suggests that any conventional cell is suitable for encapsulation in their system (Column 7, lines 1-6), and Brandhorst, Jr. teaches that his cells provide superior latitude in junction formation and low contact resistance, which would have been recognized as advantageous to one having ordinary skill in the art. In such a combination, obviously the light incident side of Brandhorst, Jr. (Top side in Figure 1) would be placed closest to the glass layer 105 of Mimura et al, since layer 105 faces incoming radiation. (Mimura et al Figure 1; Column 7, lines 25-32) Such positioning meets the limitations of claims 16, 18-20, 22, and 25.

In such a combination, the presence of sodium ions in the resin filler lying between the cells and the glass member must be considered inherent, inasmuch as the instant disclosure teaches that sodium ions diffuse from a glass layer into the sealing resin under conventional conditions (Specification Page 5, line 19 - Page 7, line 2) Specific to claim 17, the specification teaches that this level of sodium ions in the resin

results from standard test conditions, which would clearly obviously result in the combination taught above.

Regarding claim 18, since there is no teaching of a thickness required to shield diffusion of sodium ion in the instant specification, the thickness of substrate 10 of Brandhorst, Jr. is considered to inherently provide some shielding of the diffusion of sodium ion as claimed.

9. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '791, Yamagishi et al, Brandhorst, Jr, Spitzer, and the instant disclosure as applied to claims 16-20, 23, 24, 26, and 27 above, and further in view of Whitehouse.

JP '791, Yamagishi et al, Brandhorst, Jr, Spitzer, and the instant disclosure teach a combined module as described above in addressing claims 16-20, 23, 24, 26, and 27.

None among these references explicitly teaches an antireflective coating positioned between the one conductive type semiconductor layer and sodium-containing resin.

Whitehouse teaches the advantages of placing an antireflective coating on the surface of a solar cell on which light impinges, in that it increases the amount of radiation transmitted into the cell, and therefore increases the absorption and power output of the cell. (Column 1, lines 36-51)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the module of JP '791, Yamagishi et al, Brandhorst, Jr, Spitzer, and the instant disclosure by providing an antireflective coating on the surface of the cell closest to the transparent

glass layer 3, because this surface of the cell is impacted by light (JP '791; Figures 1 and 5), and Whitehouse teaches the gain in power output provided by such antireflective coatings. (Column 1, lines 36-51) As noted in the rejection above, the resin between the glass and cell will contain sodium ions, according to the teachings of the instant disclosure.

10. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandhorst, Jr, Mimura et al, and the instant disclosure as applied to claims 16-20, 22, and 25 above, and further in view of Whitehouse.

The reasoning for this rejection parallels that given in paragraph 9.

11. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mimura et al, Brandhorst, Jr., and the instant disclosure as applied to claims 16-20, 22, and 25 above, and further in view of Whitehouse.

The reasoning for this rejection parallels that given in paragraph 9.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments filed 24 April 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the instant claims are distinguished from the prior art in that sodium ion is present in the resin. However, Applicant's disclosure teaches that sodium from the front glass diffuses into the resin encapsulant. Since there is nothing

unconventional about the instantly disclosed sodium-containing glass front side member and ethylene vinyl acetate encapsulant (Note Mimura et al, Yamagishi et al and JP '791, for example), such diffusion of sodium ions into the resin must be considered inherently present in the prior art including these elements. Whether or not the prior art recognized the problem of sodium diffusion is irrelevant to the rejections. The motivations for modification are valid, and the structures taught by the prior art read on those claimed. The effect of shielding from sodium diffusion must therefore be considered inherent.

### ***Conclusion***

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Jeffrey T. Barton whose telephone number is (571) 272-1307. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JTB  
7 June 2007



NAM NGUYEN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700